



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/660,840	09/13/2000	Paul Remijan	VSI-005AX	7821

207 7590 10/04/2012  
WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN, GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP  
TEN POST OFFICE SQUARE  
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER
----------

LEUBECKER, JOHN P

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3779

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

10/04/2012

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Response to Rule 312 Communication</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/660,840	<b>Applicant(s)</b> REMIJAN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> John P. Leubecker	<b>Art Unit</b> 3779

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

1. ☒ The amendment filed on 25 September 2012 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

a) ☐ entered.

b) ☐ entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.

c) ☐ disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.

Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.

d) ☒ disapproved. See explanation below.

e) ☐ entered in part. See explanation below.

As per MPEP 714.16, the proposed amendments are not shown (a) to be needed for proper disclosure or protection of the invention, and (b) to require no substantial amount of additional work on the part of the Office. It is unclear why renumbering of the claims is being required, but such renumbering requires substantial amount of additional work including reissuance of the Notice of Allowance and a change in the Final numbering of the claims. In addition, although the change in details of proposed claims 117 and 118 (which apparently correspond to claims 89 and 90 respectively) presents a new issue as to whether there is support in the disclosure for the claimed thickness, these proposed claims are now identical and redundant. Furthermore, the proposed amendments provide for claims such as 81, 82 and 85-88 to depend from canceled claims. Because of these reasons, this examiner does not recommend entry of the proposed amendment.

	/John P. Leubecker/ Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3779
--	---